

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gershman and further in view of Brockman et al. (US 2002/0123919).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gershman and further in view of Brockman et al. (US 2002/0123919).

Applicants' arguments in traversing the rejection of claims 1-30 make use of the following citation in Gershman, col. 31, lines 6-19:

"The Supplier Profile Database 1050 contains information about the **product and service providers** integrated into the intention. The information contained in this database provides a link between the intention framework and the suppliers. It includes **product lists, features and descriptions, and addresses of the suppliers' product web sites.**

The Customer Profile Database 1060 contains personal information about the customers, such as name, address, social security number and credit card information, personal preferences, behavioral information, history, and web site layout preferences. The Supplier's Web Server 1070 provides access to all of the supplier's databases necessary to provide information and transactional support to the customer" (emphasis added).

In analyzing the preceding citation from Gershman, Applicants note that Gershman clearly distinguishes between product providers and service providers. Thus, a product provider is a provider of product(s) and a service provider is a provider of service(s). Accordingly, a service provider is not a product provider, and a product provider is not a service provider.

Moreover, the preceding citation from Gershman does not disclose anything relating to what type of information about service providers are stored in the Supplier Profile Database

Serial No.: 09/810,629

11

1050. The preceding citation from Gershman, however, does disclose that the following type of information is stored in relation to product providers: "product lists, features and descriptions, and addresses of the suppliers' product web sites". Applicants further maintain there is no disclosure anywhere in Gershman relating to what type of information about service providers may be gathered.

Accordingly, Gershman does not teach or suggest the following first feature of claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 25: gathering information about a service provider's:

- 1) characteristics (claim 1);
- 2) performance (claims 7 and 19);
- 3) security (claims 11 and 23); and
- 4) availability (claims 15 and 27).

Applicants assert that there is no disclosure anywhere in Gershman relating to gathering information about a service provider's characteristics, performance, security, or availability.

The Examiner argues that Gershman discloses the preceding first feature of claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 25 in Gershman's abstract; FIGS 1A and 1B, and col. 34, lines 8-42. In response, Applicants maintain that Gershman's abstract; FIGS 1A and 1B, and col. 34, lines 8-42 does not disclose gathering information about a service provider's characteristics, performance, security, or availability. Applicants note that Gershman, col. 34, lines 8-42, discloses an algorithm for determining the personalized product ratings of a user, which is unrelated to the preceding first feature of claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 25. Applicants request that the

Serial No.: 09/810,629

12

Examiner cite specific language in Gershman that allegedly discloses information about a service provider's characteristics, performance, security, or availability.

In addition, Gershman does not disclose the following second feature of claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 25: analyzing, to provide an outcome, the information on the service provider's:

- 1) characteristics (claim 1);
- 2) performance (claims 7 and 19);
- 3) security (claims 11 and 23); and
- 4) availability (claims 15 and 27).

In addition, Gershman does not disclose the following third feature of claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 25: generating a report responsive to the outcome derived from analyzing the information on the service provider's:

- 1) characteristics (claim 1);
- 2) performance (claims 7 and 19);
- 3) security (claims 11 and 23); and
- 4) availability (claims 15 and 27).

In addition, Gershman does not disclose the following fourth feature of claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 25: "providing the report to at least two clients of the service provider; wherein the acts of analyzing, generating, and providing are performed by a management service", wherein the report is responsive to the outcome derived from analyzing the information on the

service provider's:

- 1) characteristics (claim 1);
- 2) performance (claims 7 and 19);
- 3) security (claims 11 and 23); and
- 4) availability (claims 15 and 27).

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 25 are not unpatentable over Gershman in view of Gershman, and that claims 1, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, and 25 are in condition for allowance.

Since claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 2-6 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Since claims 8-10 depend from claim 7, Applicants contend that claims 8-10 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Since claims 12-14 depend from claim 11, Applicants contend that claims 12-14 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Since claims 16-18 depend from claim 15, Applicants contend that claims 16-18 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Since claims 20-22 depend from claim 19, Applicants contend that claims 20-22 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Since claims 24-26 depend from claim 23, Applicants contend that claims 24-26 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Serial No.: 09/810,629

14

Since claims 28-30 depend from claim 27, Applicants contend that claims 28-30 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Serial No.: 09/810,629

15

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 11/19/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

Serial No.: 09/810,629

16